DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 225 277 EA 015 311

AUTHOR Frudden, Sally; Manatt, Richard P.
TITLE Lesson Analysis--the Neglected Key to Teacher Performance Evaluation.
INSTITUTION Iowa State Univ. of Science and Technology, Ames. Dept. of Education.
SPONS AGENCY Iowa State Univ. of Science and Technology, Ames. Research Inst. for Studies in Education.; Northwest Area Foundation, St. Paul, Minn.
REPORT NO SIM-OP-82-5
PUB DATE Jun 82
NOTE 23p.; A School Improvement Model project publication; For related documents, see EA 015 309-314.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrators; Classroom Observation Techniques; Elementary Secondary Education; Evaluation Methods; *Lesson Plans; Management Development; Measurement Techniques; Rating Scales; *Teacher Evaluation
IDENTIFIERS Teacher Instructional Plans Materials Assess Scale

ABSTRACT

This School Improvement Model study examined the efficacy of three methods to improve administrator judgments of teacher performance: the preliminary perusal of teacher lesson plans, the use of lesson plan evaluation instruments, and the use of low inference (as opposed to high inference) lesson plan evaluation methods. Subjects included 529 administrators and teachers involved in professional improvement programs in 1980. Materials used were taken from the Georgia Teacher Assessment Project. Three groups of subjects were given lesson plans to study; one of these groups was also given a high inference lesson plan evaluation instrument supplying no descriptors for assigning ratings; another of the three groups was given a low inference lesson plan evaluation instrument supplying specific descriptors to assist in rating. A fourth group was given only a journal article to read as a placebo. All groups were asked to rate videotapes of teachers performing the lesson. It was found that, although low inference rating scales improved ability to assess lesson plans, preliminary study and assessment of lesson plans was not generally correlated with more accurate evaluation of teacher performance. Researchers concluded that administrators need additional training in assessing effective teaching materials and plans. The Teacher Instructional Plans and Materials Assessment Scale is included. (Author/JM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED225277

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Richard P. Manatt

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Occasional Paper No. 82-5

LESSON ANALYSIS--THE NEGLECTED KEY TO TEACHER PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

Sally Frudden
Richard P. Manatt

Published by

The School Improvement Model Project
College of Education
E005 Quadrangle
Iowa State University
Ames, Iowa 50011

June 1982

Publication of this work is supported by the Northwest Area Foundation, a consortium of five K-12 school organizations, and the Research Institute for Studies in Education at Iowa State University.

EA 015 311

ABSTRACT

Training materials for assessors in the Georgia Teacher Assessment Project were used to test the notion that teacher evaluators in public, K-12 schools do not use data concerning preinstructional planning in the evaluation of teacher performance. School administrators served as experimental subjects in eight training seminars in the U.S. and Canada. Each subject was afforded one of four levels of assistance in appraising lesson planning before evaluating a teacher's videotaped performance. Although a low inference rating instrument improved the appraisal of lesson plans, (see example) ability to assess lesson plans had no relationship to accuracy of teacher performance evaluation. In short, instrumentation and criteria did not make a difference. Indeed, the need seemed to be for training in assessing effective teaching materials and plans as well as performance evaluation.

LESSON ANALYSIS--THE NEGLECTED KEY TO TEACHER PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

In the preparation for classroom instruction, the phenomena of teacher planning is an activity which is widely encouraged, expected, and taken for granted within the educational community. Indeed, teacher preparation programs believe such planning is essential and cover this component in their training programs as well as reviewing various models of acceptable lesson planning (Koeller, 1980; Popham, 1970; Taba, 1962; Tyler, 1966). There has been an increased concern for appropriate lesson planning as recent research reports that teacher planning is linked to student achievement. One researcher, Carnahan (1980), found that students spent more time on a task, a proven contributor to pupil gain, when their teachers had a well-planned lesson. A study by Morine (1976) revealed that teachers who did more precise planning of instruction produced more pupil gain. She found that teachers with low to average student gain in math made more general statements in writing their math lessons, and conversely, teachers with high pupil gain scores attended more to cognitive aspects of the lesson in the planning stage.

If teachers planning is widely considered to be important, and good planning can be associated with good instruction resulting in student achievement, it appears logical that such planning deserves scrutiny within the teacher appraisal process. However, Robinson (1978) states this is not generally the case because many evaluators simply do not ask to preview lesson plans before making a classroom observation.

Many administrators charged with the responsibility of teacher assessment have repeatedly reported their reticence to get involved in the determination of curricular matters. According to Kowalski (1979), they feel too far and too long removed from their own classroom experiences as well as ill-prepared

by their administrative training programs to adequately assess those matters which are particularized in the preinstructional planning phase of instruction. These feelings could account for evaluators' tendency to disregard the study of lesson plans during teacher evaluation.

Most of the recent efforts to improve teacher performance evaluation have centered on instrumentation (criteria and descriptors) and operational procedures (clinical supervision vs. teacher appraisal). Iowa State University researchers have repeatedly identified clusters of categories which can be used to rate teacher performance, including productive teaching techniques, positive interpersonal relations, organized-structured classroom management, intellectual stimulation, and desirable out-of-class behavior (Hidlebaugh, 1973; Manatt, 1976 and 1980; Stow, 1979 and 1981). The Far West Laboratory (among others) has stressed instructional time and "time-on-task." Perhaps it is now time to scrutinize what performance is delivering. Shouldn't the question be "time on what task?"

That is to say, if relevant classroom observations are to be made, an administrator simply cannot determine if the instruction being observed is curriculum-congruent with long and short-range goals unless the lesson plans are studied and evaluated. To ascertain if objectives are trivial or unimportant, planning must be noted, and to determine if the teacher is engaged in an isolated instance of window dressing for the viewer's benefit, teacher planning must be examined (Berliner, 1978). It is only in this manner that evaluators can gain such insights to make improved evaluation of teacher's performances.

The present study was designed to determine if, in fact, administrators were able to take the information supplied in a teacher's lesson plan and use these data to make more accurate assessments of the teacher's performance. Three questions were investigated in the study:

1. Do administrators who study lesson plans make more accurate judgments of a teacher's performance than those who do not study lesson plans?
2. Do administrators who use evaluation instruments to study the teacher's lesson plans make more accurate judgments of the teacher's performance than those who do not use evaluation instruments?
3. Do administrators who use a low inference evaluation instrument to study the teacher's lesson plans make more accurate judgments of the teacher's performance than those who use high inference evaluation instruments (See sample instrument following)?

METHOD

Subjects

The population for this study was composed of 529 subjects who were involved in professional improvement programs during April and May, 1980, and who consented to release their test scores for research purposes. Numbered among these subjects were school superintendents, principals, vice principals, supervisors, coordinators, consultants, and teachers. The sample was drawn from eight widely-spread geographical locations, viz., Philadelphia, PA; Detroit, MI; Toronto, Canada; Portage, IN; Oyster Bay, NY; Novato, CA; Creston, IA; and Albuquerque, NM.

Materials

Lesson plans for an intermediate-grade language arts lesson, the videotaped instructional sequence of the lesson, and the evaluation instruments to assess each of these were taken from the Georgia Teacher Assessment Project (1978). The State of Georgia had used these materials to train teacher appraisers in a statewide teacher evaluation project. These

materials had been developed for that purpose under a Title IV-C grant and were in the public domain.

Two evaluation instruments were adopted from the Georgia Teacher Assessment Project to assess evalutors' skills in assessing the lesson plans, and eleven criteria were included for the evaluation of teacher performance. All of the criteria, on both instruments, specified teacher competencies developed from a massive, stratified-sampling effort surveying a population of 4,668 Georgia educators. The competencies were factored out into subgroups, two of which were used in this study, viz., Teacher Plans and Materials and Classroom Procedures (1978). These competencies were subjected to norming and validation procedures. The Georgia Prcject reported the reliability of the two instruments to be in the range of .70 to .90 in most instances. Table 1 contains the criteria used in the analysis of the teacher's plans and materials.

Table 1. TEACHER INSTRUCTIONAL PLANS AND MATERIALS ASSESSMENT SCALE

Please do not mark on this assessment scale. A rating form has been enclosed for that purpose.

The following criteria are to be rated after a thorough study of the lesson plans and materials (worksheets, etc.).

1. Do the lesson plans clearly and specifically state appropriate objectives indicating what the learner will be able to do after successful mastery of the instruction?

Check one of the following ratings:

1._____	2._____	3._____	4._____	5._____
No objectives listed or are teacher behaviors.	Objectives listed are inappropriate or in broad terms.	Objectives with a few exceptions are appropriate to topics & learners.	All objectives are appropriate to topic and learners.	In addition to #4, objectives reflect a sequence for the objectives.

2. Do the lessons plans specify procedures to appropriately accomplish objectives of the lesson?

Check one of the following ratings:

1._____	2._____	3._____	4._____	5._____
Plans do not specify teaching procedures.	Teaching procedures are specified but some seem inappropriate for objectives and/or learners or are not referenced.	Teaching procedures are referenced to objectives. Most are appropriate for objectives and/ or learners.	Teaching procedures are referenced to objectives. All are appropriate for objectives and/or learners	In addition to #4, a variety of appropriate procedures ranging from teacher-centered to learner centered approaches are indicated.

3. Do the lesson plans specify appropriate instructional content, materials, and media for accomplishing the objectives of the lesson?

Check one of the following ratings:

1.	2.	3.	4.	5.
No content, materials, or media are listed.	Content materials and media are listed but not referenced to learning activities.	Content materials and media are listed and referenced to intended objectives and learning.	In addition to #3, many appropriate resources have been included.	In addition to #4, the teacher has included an imaginative use of available resources or original materials.

4. Do the lesson plans specify appropriate materials and plans for assessing the learners mastery of the objectives?

Check one of the following ratings:

1.	2.	3.	4.	5.
No assessment plans or materials are included in the instructional unit.	Tests to assess learners are included in the unit; however many of the items are inappropriate to the instructional objectives and/or the learners.	Tests are included and are appropriate for evaluating the objectives and the learners.	In addition to #3, procedures such as interviews, questionnaires, or self-tests, are included to assess learners and/or objectives.	In addition to #4, plans and materials are included to assess attitudes of learners toward the topic.

5. Do the lesson plans outline instruction that is planned to accommodate a variety of cognitive levels?

Descriptions for the above.

A)	B)	C)	D)
Learners have an opportunity to acquire factual information and to explain or summarize.	Learners have an opportunity to apply the information to particular situation.	Learners have an opportunity to identify and clarify parts of complex ideas or synthesize knowledge by integrating information.	Learners have an opportunity to judge the value and importance of ideas and information.

Check one of the following ratings:

1.	2.	3.	4.	5.
None of the descriptions is evident.	One of the descriptions is evident.	Two to the descriptions were evident.	Three of the descriptions were evident.	Four of the descriptions were evident.

6. Do the lesson plans outline instruction that is organized to accommodate the differences in learner capabilities?

Descriptions for the above.

A)	B)	C)	D)
Current instruction is presented initially to entire group at a success level and then individualized capabilities.	Assignments for learners are differentiated according to ability.	Materials compatible with the range of learner abilities are available to achieve a given objective.	Remedial and/or enrichment activities are available for the unit.

Check one of the following ratings:

1.	2.	3.	4.	5.
None of the descriptions is evident.	One of the descriptions is evident.	Two of the descriptions are evident.	Three of the descriptions are evident.	Four of the descriptions are evident.

7. Do the lesson plans indicate instruction that is organized to accommodate the differences among learners in their learning styles?

Descriptions for the above.

A)	B)	C)	D)
Alternative resources are available for achieving a given objective.	Alternative means (group structure or teacher presentation methods) are available for achieving a given objective.	Learners are given options in responding to a given assignment (e.g., writing, drawing, verbalizing).	Learners are matched with resources and procedures for a portion of the instructional sequence.

Check one of the following ratings:

1.	2.	3.	4.	5.
None of the descriptions is evident.	One of the descriptions is evident.	Two of the descriptions are evident.	Three of the descriptions are evident.	Four of the descriptions are evident.

8. Do the lesson plans indicate instruction that is organized to accommodate differences among learners in their rates of learning?

Description for the above.

A)	B)	C)	D)
Learners may work at their own rate for some of the objectives some of the time.	Special assistance (e.g., teacher or peer tutoring) is available.	Fast learners are allowed to work on topic-related enrichment activities some of the time.	Objectives are divided between those that all learner can achieve; those that are enrichment objectives which are desirable but not essential.

Check one of the following ratings:

1.	2.	3.	4.	5.
None of the descriptions is evident.	One of the descriptions is evident.	Two of the descriptions are evident.	Three of the descriptions are evident.	Four of the descriptions are evident.

9. Do the lesson plans or material indicate teacher-made or teacher-selected evaluation material that are to be used to obtain information about learner progress?

Check one of the following ratings:

1.	2.	3.	4.	5.
No evaluations of learner progress are indicated.	Only end-of-unit or summative evaluations are used to determine learner progress.	In addition to #2, additional progress checks are used to determine learner progress.	In addition to #3, evaluations indicate individual learner progress on specific objectives.	In addition to #3 & #4, the teacher uses affective measures to assess learner attitudes.

The teacher's classroom performance in tne study was also assessed using an instrument developed by the Georgia Teacher Assessment Project. This evaluation instrument composed of eleven criteria is found in Table 2.

Table 2. CLASSROOM PROCEDURE ASSESSMENT SCALE

Please do not mark on this assessment scale. A rating form has been enclosed for that purpose.

The following criteria are to be rated after viewing the videotaped instructional session.

1. Does the teacher use audiovisual and other instructional equipment?

Check one of the following ratings:

1.	2.	3.	4.	5.
Audiovisual (e.g., projectors) or other (e.g., duplicator, transparency maker) equipment that is available and appropriate is not used.	Occasionally uses available equipment. Has trouble with it when doing so. Equipment used does not always fit planned lesson.	Usually uses audiovisual equipment at appropriate times in lesson. Shows evidence of mastering the operation of most equipment.	Highly skillful use of audiovisual equipment at appropriate times. Media presented blends smoothly with other kinds of instruction.	In addition to the items in #4, the teacher shows evidence of skillfully preparing original materials for use with audiovisual or other equipment.

2. Does the teacher use instructional materials that provide appropriate practice on the objectives?

Check one of the following ratings:

1.	2.	3.	4.	5.
Materials chosen are irrelevant to the topic or objectives.	Materials chosen are related to the topics being studied but not to the objectives.	Most materials chosen provide for practice on specific objectives. Some of the practice may be insufficient in quantity to achieve the objectives.	Materials chosen are relevant to the objectives. Learners are given ample opportunity to practice and achieve the objectives.	In addition to the items in #4, the teacher uses formal or informal progress assessment techniques to determine whether the practice individual learners receive is sufficient.

3. Does the teacher organize learning activities in a logical sequence?

Check one of the following ratings:

1.	2.	3.	4.	5.
Activities used in the classroom are unrelated to one another or to the objectives.	Activities relate to a common topic within lessons but many activities seem out of sequence.	Activities are arranged to present ideas so that one builds on another. Only occasionally are these problems of sequence.	No instances of problems in sequencing learning activities are noted.	In addition to the items in #4, activities provide an opportunity to acquire prerequisites if learners have not already done so.

Table 2. (Continued)

4. Does the teacher demonstrate ability to conduct lessons using a variety of teaching methods?

Teaching methods such as the following may be observed: drill, inquiry, discussion, role playing, demonstration, problem solving, etc.

Check one of the following ratings:

1.	2.	3.	4.	5.
No teaching method is used acceptably.	One method is used acceptably.	Two methods are used acceptably.	Three methods are used acceptably.	Four methods are used acceptably.

5. Does the teacher use teaching methods appropriate for objectives and learners?

Descriptions for the above.

A. Teaching methods are matched to objectives.

B. Teaching methods are matched to learners.

C. A smooth transition is made from one method to another.

D. The classroom environment is arranged for the teaching method.

Check one of the following ratings:

1.	2.	3.	4.	5.
None of the descriptors is evident.	One descriptor is evident.	Two descriptors are evident.	Three descriptors are evident.	Four descriptors are evident.

6. Does the teacher demonstrate ability to work with individuals, small groups, and large groups?

Descriptions for the above.

A. The group size for instruction is matched to the objective.

B. The teacher's role is appropriate to the group size being used.

C. The changes from one group size to another are smooth.

D. Different group sizes that are matched to the objectives are used.

Check one of the following ratings:

1.	2.	3.	4.	5.
None of the descriptors is evident.	One descriptor is evident.	Two descriptors are evident.	Three descriptors are evident.	Four descriptors are evident.

Table 2. (Continued)

7. Does the teacher use procedures which initially get learners involved in lessons?

Descriptions for the above.

A. Helps learners recall past experiences or knowledge.

B. Uses interests of learners as a link to new activities.

C. Stimulates interest in new activities with such things as discrepant events or thought-provoking questions.

D. Helps learners understand what they may achieve by participating in the new activities.

Check one fo the following ratings:

1._____	2._____	3._____	4._____	5._____
None of the descriptors is evident.	One descriptor is evident.	Two descriptors are evident.	Three descriptors are evident.	Four descriptors are evident.

8. Does the teacher maintain learner involvement in lessons?

Check one of the following ratings:

1._____	2._____	3._____	4._____	5._____
Most learners(75%) seem to be off task (learners are not attending to the teacher, materials, or other appropriate foci for an activity).	Many learners(50%) are on task but the remainder show only superficial attention to lessons.	Most learners(75%) are on task (activity engaged in the lesson).	High on-task(90%) behavior is evident.	All learners are on task.

9. Does the teacher demonstrate knowledge in the subject area?

Check one of the following ratings:

1._____	2._____	3._____	4._____	5._____
The knowledge demonstrated in the classroom is inaccurate or out-of-date.	Does not demonstrate knowledge of the subject area when it would be appropriate to do so.	Subject area knowledge demonstrated is accurate and related to the subject.	Demonstrates accurate and up-to-date knowledge of the subject to arouse the interest of the learners.	In addition to the items in #4, uses knowledge of the subject area to show learners the importance of the topic in the world outside the classroom.

Table 2. (Continued)

10. Does the teacher present accurate information abut the topic being taught?

Check one of the following ratings:

1.	2.	3.	4.	5.
Information presented to learners is clearly inaccurate or the topic is inconsistent with what is currentiy appropriate for the level taught.	Some information is inaccurate or inconsistent with what is currently considered appropriate.	Information on the topic is accurate. Sources of information and learning materials are timely.	Regular text or other curriculum material is supplemented with recent newspaper, journal, or other information.	A variety of resources are used to make classroom information up to date. The teacher helps learners understand how information (knowledge, values, procedures, etc.) in the topic area has changed over the years.

11. Does the teacher provide learners with information on the purpose and importance of topics?

Check one of the following ratings:

1.	2.	3.	4.	5.
Does not designate the purpose or importance of a topic.	Fails to relate specific topics to their purpose or importance in a content area.	The purpose or importance of most topics studied is conveyed to learners.	Topics are taught in context. The teacher shows how topics are but a portion of a larger content area.	In addition to the items in #4, the teacher encourages (or provides opportunities for) learners to either question or relate to specific topics which are important to a content area.

Validity of the instruments was established in a variety of ways. Content validity was determined through verification studies using experts' opinions. Concurrent validity was determined by comparing teachers with varying years experience and finding that the more experienced teachers tended to score higher on the instrument. Finally, construct validity was examined through factor analysis correlating with the Purdue Observation Rating Scale.

The Georgia Teacher Assessment Project supplied a scoring rationale for each of the criteria used in their project. A sample of 40 educators, teachers, administrators, and college faculty provided consensus scores to be used as standards for rating proficiency. Those suggested ratings were adopted in the study as the accurate rating score.

Two packets were utilized by participants in the present study. The first packet was used in conjunction with the evaluation of the lesson plans and comprised the experimental factors of the research. Four types of Packet One were used in the experiment:

1. a journal article discussing teacher assessment (placebo group);
2. the lesson plans for an intermediate language arts lesson;
3. the same lesson plans as used by group two and a high inference evaluation instrument which supplied no descriptors for assigning ratings in the lesson plan assessment; and
4. the exact lesson plans given to group two and three and a low inference evaluation instrument which supplied very specific descriptors to assist in the judging of the lesson plans.

A scoring form was included for the recording of responses. This form was made up of two attached sheets of pressure sensitized paper allowing for responses to be duplicated on the bottom sheet. This duplicated copy was returned to the workshop directors and the other was retained by the participant.

The second packet measured the dependent variable, i.e., contained the evaluation instrument measuring the eleven criteria concerning teacher performance. A pressure sensitized rating form was also included in this packet. All ratings were made on a one-to-five scale. The lowest score was indicated by a 1, and the highest score a 5.

Procedure

All participants were involved in a simulated exercise in teacher evaluation as a part of a workshop on teacher performance appraisal. All subjects received one of four different experimental packets which were randomly distributed. Participants were instructed to carefully study the contents of the packet and subsequently use that information to assist them in the evaluation of the teacher's classroom performance. Further, they were asked to assess the information found in their packet and to rate it on an enclosed plans and materials evaluation instrument. If no evaluation instrument was included in their packet, the subject was asked to submit a narrative evaluation of the packet's contents.

Following this, subjects were asked to view the teacher's classroom instruction recorded on a 20 minute videotape clip. Subsequent to viewing the tape, all subjects rated the teacher's performance on the 11 criteria on the classroom procedures evaluation instrument.

The scores rendered from these two evaluation activities, rating of lesson plans and rating of teacher performance, were gathered, collated and statistically analyzed. Data were analyzed using One-Way Analysis of Variance with Contrasts found in the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences. In this manner, it was determined if significant differences in mean ratings occurred between groups being compared.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The first contrast compared the mean of the experimental group with no lesson plans (the reading of a journal article as a placebo activity), with the combined mean of all of the other experimental groups which had had an opportunity to review the teacher's plans. The findings of the 11 measured criteria (Table 3) reveal that the means differed significantly

only on criterion 4 ($p < .05$). This would indicate that, generally speaking, the study of lesson plans does not relate to accuracy of an evaluator's judgment of the teacher performance except when assessing the teacher's planned use of a variety of instructional methods in the lesson.

The second contrast (Table 4) compared the mean of the experimental groups using no evaluation instruments to study lesson plans with those of the mean of the groups provided evaluation instruments to guide in the assessment process. In this instance, the use of evaluation instruments appeared to focus the evaluator's attention in such a manner as to contribute to more accurate assessment of teacher performance when the appraiser was determining if the teacher's learning activities were organized in a logical sequence (Criterion 3), if the teacher demonstrated knowledge in the subject area (Criterion 9), and if the teacher presented accurate information about the topic (Criterion 10) ($p < .05$, Table 3).

Table 3. - Analysis of Variance Summary on Accuracy of Teacher Performance (ATP) Contrasting Placebo Group Vs. Lesson Plans Only, Lesson Plans With High Inference, and Lesson Plans With Low Inference

	F	F probability	Contrast t	t probability
ATP (Use of AV)	1.16	.33	.77	.44
ATP 2 (Practice on objectives)	2.09	.10	.74	.08
ATP 3 (Logical sequence)	1.93	.12	.70	.48
ATP 4 (Variety of methods)	4.39	.01	-2.23	.03*
ATP 5 (Appropriate methods)	.53	.67	-1.17	.24
ATP 6 (Group sizes)	1.26	.29	-0.85	.40
ATP 7 (Learner involved)	1.72	.16	.89	.38
ATP 8 (Maintain involvement)	.25	.86	-0.13	.90
ATP 9 (Knowledge of subject)	2.74	.04	.11	.91
ATP 10 (Accurate information)	1.82	.14	-0.33	.74
ATP 11 (Purpose of topic)	1.20	.31	1.38	.17

*p $<$ .05

Table 4. - Analysis of Variance Summary on Accuracy of Teacher Performance (ATP) Contrasting Placebo Group and Lesson Plans Only Vs. Lesson Plans with High Inference and Lesson Plans With Low Inference

	F	F probability	Contrast t	t probability
ATP 1 (Use of AV)	1.16	.325	-0.36	.72
ATP 2 (Practice on objectives)	2.09	.100	-1.69	.09
ATP 3 (Logical sequence)	1.93	.124	-2.29	.02*
ATP 4 (Variety of methods)	4.39	.005	-1.82	.07
ATP 5 (Appropriate methods)	0.53	.665	-0.40	.69
ATP 6 (Group sizes)	1.26	.287	-1.43	.15
ATP 7 (Learners involved)	1.72	.162	-1.24	.38
ATP 8 (Maintain involvement)	0.25	.861	-0.33	.45
ATP 9 (Knowledge of subject)	2.74	.043	-2.33	.02*
ATP 10 (Accurate information)	1.82	.142	-2.31	.02*
ATP 11 (Purpose of topic)	1.20	.310	0.88	.38

*$p < .05$

The final statistical contrast compared the means of only those experimental groups utilizing evaluation instruments, one with high inference descriptor items and the other with low inference descriptor items. Of the eleven measured criteria (Table 5) only Criterion 4 had a significantly different rating. This would indicate that in general teacher evaluators are not significantly aided by a low inference instrument in making more accurate judgments of teacher performance except when assessing the teacher's use of a variety of instructional methods.

CONCLUSION

The present study appears to confirm the apprehensions expressed by many administrators, those stating they feel inadequate to deal with certain aspects of the curricular planning of instruction, and may indicate they truly need assistance when evaluating curriculum matters. It may also be concluded from this research that administrators, when evaluating a teacher, demonstrate an inability to utilize the information contained in a lesson plan to make more accurate judgments of the ensuing instructional activity. Furthermore, the use of an evaluation instrument to focus and guide the appraiser in the evaluation process was not of much benefit, even when the instrument used descriptive, low inference criteria.

If Morine and Carnahan (1976, 1980) are correct in their assertion that the need for evaluating teacher planning and applying it to classroom processes is important because of its relationship to student achievement, then the finding that administrators cannot assess plans and transfer this input into a more accurate assessment of the teacher's performance takes on obvious importance.

Table 5. - Analysis of Variance Summary on Accuracy of Teacher Performance (ATP) Contrasting Lesson Plans With High Inference Vs. Lesson Plans With Low Inference Instruments

	F	F probability	Contrast t	t probability
ATP 1 (Use of AV)	1.16	.325	1.66	.10
ATP 2 (Practice on objectives)	2.09	.100	0.52	.60
ATP 3 (Logical sequence)	1.93	.124	0.07	.94
ATP 4 (Variety of methods)	4.39	.005	2.24	.03*
ATP 5 (Appropriate methods)	0.53	.665	0.23	.82
ATP 6 (Group sizes)	1.26	.287	1.02	.31
ATP 7 (Learners involved)	1.72	.162	1.67	.10
ATP 8 (Maintain involvement)	0.25	.861	0.40	.69
ATP 9 (Knowledge of subject)	2.74	.043	1.66	.10
ATP 10 (Accurate information)	1.82	.142	-0.17	.86
ATP 11 (Purpose of topic)	1.20	.310	0.98	.33

* $p < .05$

The present study seems to indicate that administrators need considerable assistance to function effectively as teacher evaluators. The existing educational climate dictates that administrators be committed to valid, reliable and legally discriminating appraisal of teachers for purposes of promotion, tenure, and termination. In addition, the need for administrators to be the catalyst in the improvement of instruction for classroom teachers places another responsibility on the professional functioning of those administrative officers. Lesson analysis and performance appraisal in all likelihood are two separate and distinct skills, and it seems reasonable to suggest that effective training programs for teacher evaluators must include input and guided practice on both. By receiving such training, administrators will be better prepared to maximize their roles as competent teacher evaluators and educational leaders.

REFERENCES

Berliner, David. Instructional Time in Research on Teaching. Mimeographed paper (paper presented to the American Educational Research Association, April, 1977, available through the Far West Laboratory for Educational Development, San Francisco).

Berliner, David. Successful Classroom Teaching and Learning. Unpublished paper for the Educational Forum. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Education, 1978.

Carnahan, Richard S. Jr. The Effects of Teacher Planning on Classroom Processes. Madison, Wisconsin: Wisconsin Research and Development Center, University of Wisconsin, 1980.

Georgia State Department of Education Teacher Performance Assessment Instruction. Atlanta, GA: State Department of Education, 1978.

Hidlebaugh, Everett. Naperville (Illinois) Teacher Performance Evaluation Items, The District, May 1973, 20.

Koeller, Shirley and Thompson, Elton. Another Look at Lesson Planning. Educational Leadership, 1980, 4, 673-675.

Kowalski, Theodore J. The Principal's Role in Curriculum Development: What are the Barriers?" Contemporary Education, 1979, 50, 159-161.

Mager, Robert F. Preparing Instructional Objectives. Palo Alto, CA: Fearon Publisher, 1962.

Manatt, Richard P. Teacher Performance Criteria and Student Gains. National Science Foundation Grant No. GU 3373, College of Education, Iowa State University, Ames, IA, 1980.

Manatt, Richard, Hidlebaugh, Everett, and Palmer, Kenneth. Improved Teacher Performance Evaluation With Improved Rating Scales. National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, 1976, 68:401, 21-23.

Morine, Greta. A Study of Teacher Planning: Beginning Teacher Evaluation Study. San Francisco: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, 1976.

Popham, W. James and Baker, Eva I. Systematic Instruction. Engelwood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1970.

Robinson, John J. The Observation Report--A Help or a Nuisance? NAASP Bulletin, 1978, 62, 22-26.

Stow, Shirley. Using Effectiveness Research in Teacher Evaluation. Educational Leadership, 1979, 37:1, 55-58.

Stow, Shirley and Sweeney, James. Developing a Teacher Performance Evaluation System. Educational Leadership, 1981, 38:7, 538-541.

Taba, Hilda. Curriculum Development Theory and Practice. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1962.

Tyler, Ralph W. New Dimensions in Curriculum Development. Phi Delta Kappan, 1966, 48, 25-28.